



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/2
9 February 2018

ENGLISH ONLY

REPORT OF THE TECHNICAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11*

Montreal, Canada 6 - 9 February 2018

INTRODUCTION

1. In response to paragraphs 9 (a(i)), 10(a) and 10(b) of decision XIII/2 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, the Executive Secretary convened the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 ([2017-099](#)),¹ held at the headquarters of the International Civil Aviation Organization, in Montreal, from 6 to 9 February 2018. This workshop was held in parallel with the Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas ([2017-098](#))² that was organized pursuant to decision XIII/9, with joint breakout and plenary sessions on relevant topics.

2. In paragraph 9(a(i)) of decision XIII/2, Parties, other Governments, relevant partners, regional agencies, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, in conjunction with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, taking into account information provided by, and in consultation with Parties and other Governments, were invited to undertake a review of experiences, *inter alia*, on protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures taking into account the work of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and other appropriate expert bodies. In paragraph 10(a), the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to develop voluntary guidance on the elements listed in paragraph 9(a), noting lessons learned from the relevant biodiversity-related conventions and agreements; in paragraph 10(b), to organize a technical expert workshop or workshops to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11; and in paragraph 10(c), to report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice at a meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

3. Accordingly, the purpose of the Workshop was: a) to discuss and develop scientific and technical advice pursuant to paragraph 10(b) and b) to develop the necessary voluntary guidance in line with paragraphs 10(a) of decision XIII/2.

4. The workshop was attended by 13 government-nominated experts from Australia, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Pakistan, Uganda, South Africa, and Turkmenistan; and by representatives of organizations, namely, the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA), China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF)

* Issued without editing.

¹ <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/PAEM-2018-01>

² <https://www.cbd.int/meetings/MCB-EM-2018-01>

represented by the Inclusive Development Consulting, Territories and Areas Conserved by Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (ICCA Consortium), Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC), International Union for Conservation of Nature-World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA), International Union for Conservation of Nature-Global Protected Areas Programme (IUCN-GPAP), Parks Canada, World Wildlife Fund (WWF-Indonesia), and United Nations Environment Programme-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC). The list of the participants is presented in **annex I**. The workshop was organized with the generous financial support of the Government of Italy.

5. Joint breakout and plenary sessions allowed participants of the two workshops to engage in discussions and deliberations on relevant topics to enable the development of the technical and scientific advice for other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in both realms (terrestrial and marine).

ITEM 1. OPENING OF THE WORKSHOP

6. A joint plenary session was held for the formal opening of the two workshops at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday, 6 February 2018. Mr. Sarat Babu Gidda, Head of the Conservation and Sustainable Use unit and Senior Programme Officer for Protected Areas at the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Master of Ceremony for the session, welcomed the participants and introduced the first two speakers and gave them the floor.

7. Mr. Kevin Stringer, Associate Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, first delivered his opening remarks on behalf of the Government of Canada. He welcomed the participants of the two workshops and thanked the Secretariat for its on-going efforts to support the implementation of the Convention, and to advance the protected areas and marine biodiversity agenda. He also thanked the Secretariat for organizing the two technical expert workshops and for accepting Canada's offer to host the Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas. Mr. Stringer described Canada's commitment to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, including its successful domestic interim target of 5 per cent protection of marine and coastal areas by 2017 and by 10 per cent by 2020. He also indicated Canada's support for work under the Convention's leadership and its eagerness to engage with international experts on biodiversity conservation issues.

8. Mr. Stringer then described the current context as an exciting time for biodiversity, protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) in both the terrestrial and marine environments. He mentioned that he looks forward to the official guidance for OECMs. He emphasized the critical importance of the workshops in supporting the twenty-second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. He indicated that it does not matter whether OECM or OEABCM is used as abbreviation but the focus on the qualitative aspects matters. He also mentioned that the decisions from the workshops should be science- and expert-based and the results of full participation of relevant stakeholders. In conclusion, Mr. Stringer wished the participants a productive meeting and invited them to also attend the 5th International Marine Protected Area Congress (IMPAC-5) in 2021 in Vancouver, Canada, to reflect on and probably continue celebrating the success of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

9. Mr. Gidda then invited Mr. David Cooper, Deputy Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, to address the participants. He mentioned that Mr. Cooper was the main architect of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and also indirectly responsible for the rigmarole of facilitating the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 during the last seven years, before giving him the floor.

10. Mr. Cooper delivered his opening statement on behalf of Dr. Cristiana Paşca Palmer, Executive Secretary of the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. He welcomed the participants and explained that the two workshops were convened in parallel to offer a unique opportunity to share perspectives and experiences across the wide range of stakeholders engaged in area-based conservation both in terrestrial and marine environments. He thanked the Government of Canada for hosting the

workshops and acknowledged, with great appreciation, the financial contributions of Fisheries and Oceans Canada, the Government of Norway and the Government of Italy, which supported the organization of the two workshops. He noted that the adoption of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, in 2010, was a historic achievement for the global community, providing an ambitious benchmark for the future and clearly articulating strongly the essential role of biodiversity in sustainable development. Since 2010, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets have had a clear impact around the world, catalysing political attention and action on the ground, as well as inspiring and informing other global processes, *inter alia*, the Sustainable Development Goals.

11. Mr. Cooper further emphasized that, among the 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets, Target 11 is one of the best known, implemented, and one that has exerted the biggest impact. He mentioned some of the important progresses of Target 11, for instance, that global coverage of terrestrial protected areas has already reached 15 per cent compared to the 17 per cent target by 2020; marine protected area (MPA) coverage has reached almost 7 per cent for global ocean - an almost three-fold increase from the 2.4 per cent protection level in 2010. When areas under national jurisdiction are considered, MPAs represent already 16 per cent. This figure is projected to exceed 23 per cent by 2020 compared to the 10 per cent target in Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. He indicated that progress in all of the elements of the target, including effective and equitable management, ecological representativeness and connectivity, still lags behind. Mr. Cooper pointed out that while governments have been the primary actors in establishing and managing protected areas, other stakeholders have also been playing a key role as they should, e.g. in establishment and management of OECMs, and indigenous peoples and communities conserved areas (ICCAs) and private protected areas (PPAs).

12. In conclusion, Mr. Cooper encouraged that the week should be devoted to enhancing understanding of how a diverse range of tools and approaches could be used to contribute to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 before the fast-approaching 2020 target date. He urged the participants to keep an open mind, leave behind their different perceptions and pre-conceived notions, and focus on how best the ambitious commitments can be delivered. He, then, expressed his hope that these workshops would provide Parties with a sound foundation and support to their roadmaps to achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and also pave the pathway towards the post-2020 biodiversity agenda.

13. Item 3 on the workshop background, scope and expected output, presented below, was also covered during this joint plenary session. The opening ceremony was officially completed at 10:30 am. Group photos of the participants of the two workshops were then taken before the participants of the two workshops started their respective work.

ITEM 2. ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

2.1. Election of co-chairs

14. After a short coffee break that took place after the group photo session, the participants of this workshop convened in their meeting room to begin their work. Mr. Gidda welcomed them, once again, and presented the agenda item to the floor. He, then, invited them to propose and elect the Co-chairs for the workshop. Accordingly, based on proposals from the floor, Mr. Gilles Seutin, Chief Ecosystems Scientist, Protected Areas Establishment and Conservation Directorate at Parks Canada and Ms. Eugenia Argueda Montezuma from the Costa Rican Ministry of Environment and Energy and SBSTTA Bureau Member, were elected as Co-chairs of the workshop.

2.2. Adoption of the agenda

15. The Co-chairs, Mr. Seutin and Ms. Montezuma invited the floor to consider, for adoption, the provisional agenda prepared by the Executive Secretary and contained in [CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/1](#). The provisional agenda was adopted without amendments.

2.3. Organization of work

16. The participants were invited to consider, for adoption, the proposed provisional organization of work for the meeting, as contained in **annex II** of the annotations to the provisional agenda [CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/1/Add.1](#). The organization of work was adopted without amendment.

ITEM 3. WORKSHOP BACKGROUND, SCOPE AND EXPECTED OUTPUT

17. This item was covered during the joint plenary session after the opening ceremony. As a complement to the organization of the work and to set the tone, the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity together with partners provided the background, purpose, scope, and the expected output of the workshops. Presentations were first delivered by Mr. Gidda and Ms. Kathy Mackinnon, Chair of IUCN-WCPA and Co-chair of IUCN-WCPA Task Force to inform the participants about the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Then, presentations by Ms. Jihyun Lee, Environmental Affairs Officer for Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Ms. Susana Fuller (Resource person) followed to provide information about the Expert Workshop on Marine Protected Areas and Other effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas.

A. Technical Expert Workshop on OECMs for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11

18. Mr. Gidda mentioned that in paragraph 10(b) of decision XIII/2, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to organize a technical expert workshop to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, identification and management approaches of other area-based conservation measures and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and that the objectives and outcome of this workshop flow primarily from this decision. Then, he gave the background, and defined the scope and the expected output. He reminded the participants of the definitions of “protected areas”, and “*in-situ* conservation” as provided in Article 2³ of the Convention and traced how the concept of “conserved areas” became integrated with “protected areas” and evolved through successive decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. He called attention to the factors that led to the success of the Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA), hailed by the Parties to the Convention, as well as conservation agencies, as one of the programmes with the highest rate of implementation, and described the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, especially Strategic Goal C and Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. These factors included broadening the political support and commitment, aligning available funding with country action plans and enabling better global, regional and national technical support networks.

19. Referring to the status of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets as of 2014, as reported by the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, Mr. Gidda mentioned that the results of this assessment underscored the significant progress that has been made and indicated that with more focussed efforts, over the next three years, many elements of Target 11, both marine and terrestrial, could be achieved by 2020. He reiterated that in order to achieve Target 11, it was imperative to know the current status, the gaps, what needs to be achieved, and also set priority actions (roadmaps) to fill the gaps and achieve the target on time. The Secretariat has assisted Parties to do so through extensive regional capacity-building efforts. Currently, the Secretariat is involved in various efforts to facilitate the effective implementation of the roadmaps identified by the Parties to the Convention through the use of coordination agencies and enabling regional implementation support networks, as a country driven process, with concerted efforts by all stakeholders.

20. Mr. Gidda also showed how implementation of the actions for Target 11 also contribute, *inter alia*, to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, the requirements under other multi-lateral environmental agreements, relevant targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Agreement on

³ “*In-situ* conservation” means the conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats and the maintenance and recovery of viable populations of species in their natural surroundings and, in the case of domesticated or cultivated species, in the surroundings where they have developed their distinctive properties. “*Protected area*” means a geographically defined area which is designated or regulated and managed to achieve specific conservation objective.

climate change. He also mentioned the importance of the multiple benefits that would be generated through the achievement of Target 11, including food and water security, health and poverty eradication, and of showcasing these benefits to make the case for implementation by Parties and encourage donors to invest and support them at national level. He reminded participants that Target 11 includes both protected areas and OECMs, and that the significant progress in achieving Target 11 was based on only the reported protected areas data in the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA). He explained the information on OECMs was not yet collected due to lack of clarity on what they are and are not, both in the marine and terrestrial realms.

21. Mr. Gidda reminded the participants that the workshops provide an excellent opportunity for the provision of the necessary technical and scientific advice pursuant to decision XIII/2 and XIII/9 of the Conference of the Parties. He mentioned that on 9 February 2018, when the joint plenary session of the workshops adopts the consolidated scientific and technical advice on OECMs, it would be a historic event. This is because translating such advice/guidance, into a reality on the ground would not only contribute to the progress in the elements of Target 11 and the achievement of this target, but would also contribute, *inter alia*, to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals 14.5, 15.2 and 15.3. He recalled that the Conference of the Parties adopted the PoWPA exactly 14 years previously, in February 2004, in Malaysia ([decision VII/28](#)). He concluded that the adoption of the consolidated scientific and technical advice, like the PoWPA, will contribute substantially to the achievement of Target 11, as well as other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and make this historic moment even more memorable.

22. The next presentation was on “*Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures: Definition and Guidance*” by Ms. Kathy MacKinnon. She started by explaining the development of the draft *Guidelines for Recognizing and Reporting other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures* developed by the IUCN-WCPA Task Force, pursuant to the request contained in paragraph 10 of decision XI/24 and presented as an information document for the two workshops⁴. She explained that the Task Force, created in 2015, consists of more than 120 conservation experts globally and that its work has benefited from several workshops, as well as extensive consultation with Parties at side events held on the margins of meetings of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention which called for further work on OECMs and explicitly recognized the work by IUCN. Accordingly in November 2017, the Task Force circulated the draft guidelines document to the Parties of the Convention for feedback and comments, through a notification issued ([2017-112](#)) with the collaboration of the Secretariat. Hence, the guidelines document has been revised for the workshops, and will be further revised for the twenty second meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice.

23. Ms. MacKinnon explained that the guidelines provide a draft definition, criteria for identification of OECMs and information on the types of management approaches. She presented the IUCN definition of protected areas⁵ and highlighting that conservation is the primary objective. She explained that OECMs do not necessarily require a primary conservation objective; but that the areas should be managed in a way that leads to positive biodiversity conservation outcomes in the long-term, regardless of the management objective. There must also be a direct causal link between: a) the area’s overall-long term management; and b) the *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity. She also explained that the definition and criteria listed in the document are applicable to all ecosystems (terrestrial or marine). OECMs can cover the full range of governance types; and although their size can vary, it should be large enough to achieve the *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity of interest.

24. Ms. MacKinnon reminded that areas already designated as protected areas or lie within protected areas should not be counted as OECMs, and that not all area-based conservation or sustainable uses of biodiversity should be mapped to Target 11, if there are other more appropriate Aichi Biodiversity

⁴ [CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/INF/1](#); and [CBD/MCB/EM/2018/1/INF/5](#)

⁵ IUCN Definition of Protected Areas: *A ‘Protected Area’ is a clearly defined geographical space, recognized, dedicated and managed, through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long term conservation of nature with associated ecosystem services and cultural values.*

Targets for them: e.g. Target 6 for sustainable harvesting of fish, invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants; or Target 7 for sustainable management of agriculture, aquaculture and forestry. She indicated that an area where there is no management regime, but which is incidentally intact, is not an OECM e.g. High Seas and that the management should include 'effective means of control of activities that could impact biodiversity', e.g. legal measures or other, such as customary laws and sanctions. She, then, presented case studies of governance by IPLCs in Namibia showing the importance of the coverage of ICCAs and the protection of ecoregions.

25. In terms of achieving conservation in OECMs, she explained the three types of conservation: a) primary, b) secondary, and c) ancillary; as well as the four criteria of the screening tool. She reminded that achieving Target 11 was about achieving its qualitative elements as well as the quantitative targets and that OECMs can equally contribute to Target 11 and to multiple benefits as the reported protected areas. In conclusion, she mentioned that recognition and support for OECMs can contribute to Target 11 through increases in ecological representation, enhanced coverage of areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services and connectivity. She indicated that recognition of these areas can engage a broader range of stakeholders and sectors, and highlighted that potential OECMs should be screened on a case-by-case basis. She then mentioned the importance of reporting, monitoring effectiveness and performance standards, as well as implementation with her concluding remarks.

26. During the question and answer session, various details were discussed by the experts of the two workshops and experiences from different countries were shared. The comments included that there were some OECMs were even better protected than some protected areas, and that these may need national or legal recognition, recording, as well as reporting. OECMs' emphasis on outcome and effectiveness was found impressive. So, it was mentioned that it would be useful to assess the added value of these areas and that the wider ambition and the long-term sustainability outcome should be remembered when evaluating OECMs: they generate multiple benefits just like protected areas. Hence, the importance of good governance to guarantee sustainability on these areas was also mentioned as important.

B. Expert Workshop on MPAs and OECMs for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in Marine and Coastal Areas

27. Ms. Jihyun Lee started her presentation by discussing the various work of the Convention on marine and coastal biodiversity. Unsustainable fishing practices, marine debris, underwater noise, ocean acidification, impacts of climate change and anthropogenic activities were mentioned as some of the major issues. She also discussed the different initiatives and efforts under the programme of work on marine and coastal areas.

28. Ms. Lee explained that, although MPAs are an important element of the Convention's programme of work on marine and coastal biodiversity, this was the first time that a workshop, focusing on marine issues under Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, was convened. The workshop was also organized in close collaboration with the PoWPA, parallel to the technical expert workshop on OECMs for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Then, she outlined the scope of the workshop, which would include consolidating national experiences and lessons learned in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in marine and coastal areas. Noting that the analysis of commitments by the global communities indicate that the target of 10%, in the text of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, will be surpassed to reach at least 23 per cent by 2020 in marine areas within national jurisdiction, she emphasized that despite this very real success there were some important qualitative elements of Target 11 in marine and coastal areas that required progress and needed to be discussed. Then, Ms. Lee outlined the objectives of the workshop, established by decisions XIII/9 and XIII/2 of the Conference of the Parties, as well as the expected outputs, which would focus on the qualitative aspects of Target 11 in coastal and marine areas, in addition to the definition, management approaches, identification of OECMs, and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 which will be covered through joint breakout and plenary sessions with the Technical Expert Workshop on OECMs for achieving 11.

29. Ms. Lee highlighted the efforts of the Secretariat, through the marine and coastal programme of work, to engage various sectors in the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. For example, after continued efforts over the past decade, the fisheries sector was now engaged in efforts to achieve the

Targets in their entirety, not just Target 6, through the “Sustainable Ocean Initiative (SOI) Global Dialogue with Regional Seas Organizations, and Regional Fisheries Bodies on Accelerating Progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets”. She emphasized the importance of engaging key sectors in the achievement of this very important target and the need to consolidate experience and provide more guidance. She then introduced the Convention’s criteria for ecologically or biologically significant marine areas (EBSAs), and cautioned that EBSAs are not MPAs, neither fishing closures nor have any implications for jurisdictional matters. EBSAs are special areas in the ocean that serve important purposes, in one way or another, to support the healthy functioning of oceans and the many services that it provides. Ms. Lee mentioned that 71 per cent of the planet is ocean and explained that the EBSA process has thus far addressed more than 74 per cent, and that 19 per cent of the total ocean area was now described as meeting the EBSA criteria. She noted that EBSAs provide an important scientific input to marine spatial planning, and referred the participants to the relevant website (www.cbd.int/ebsa) for more information.

30. The presentation by Ms. Susanna Fuller (Consultant, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and Resource Person) was entitled “*Overview of Marine Protected Areas and Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures: Towards 2020*”. Ms. Fuller started by reminding that Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, as also reiterated in Sustainable Development Goal 14 for the conservation and sustainable use of the oceans, seas and marine resources, commits Parties to the Convention to protect 10 per cent of their marine and coastal environment by 2020. She mentioned that analysis of data from the WDPA indicate progress towards the achievement of the target: 6.97 per cent of the target is already met for the global oceans with additional commitments of at least 4 per cent expected to be achieved by 2020. She reiterated that the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 in marine and coastal areas will contribute to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as various international agreements, as spatial measures can result in multiple benefits, *inter alia*, to species, biodiversity, habitats and ecosystems. Target 11 is being met both by MPAs, as defined by the Convention on Biological Diversity and where the primary objective is conservation of biodiversity, as well as OECMs, where biodiversity outcomes are achieved, but the areas are not designated formally as protected, including areas protected by indigenous peoples and local communities, privately protected areas or sector-based measures that protect *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity.

31. Ms. Fuller also explained that marine and coastal environments have particular ecological and jurisdictional characteristics that should be taken into account when setting objectives for, designing, managing, monitoring and enforcing protected areas in these environments. Then, she expressed that concerns remain about the strength of protection in many of the areas being reported and claimed as protected, through MPAs and OECMs, and more work needs to be done to set clear standards, and simplify reporting mechanisms through which effectiveness can be measured. Effective protection elements include design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems; adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and delivery of protected area objectives, including conservation of values. She further mentioned that gaps exist in reporting on effective protection, accepted indicators for equity of protected area measures, connectivity, and climate change mitigation as well as indicators to assess how MPAs and OECMs are integrated into the broader seascape. She mentioned also that for existing and new MPAs and OECMs qualitative and quantitative measures of effectiveness must be a focus going forward, with a commitment to strengthening protection in order to stem the tide of marine and coastal biodiversity loss and maintain and restore ecosystem services.

32. During the question and answer period various details were discussed by the experts of the two workshops and experiences from different countries were also shared. Comments from the floor included the importance of focussing on the long-term outcome (sustainability) and good governance in addition to effectiveness of management. The big task ahead was acknowledged and the importance of the joint workshops to provide consolidated scientific and technical advice and also clear the misperception in understanding what OECMs are by different agencies was highlighted.

ITEM 4. DETAILED INTRODUCTION OF THE THREE SUB-ITEMS OF PARAGRAPH 10(b) OF DECISION XIII/2

33. The Co-chairs of the Technical Expert Workshop on Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures for Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, Mr. Seutin and Ms. Montezuma, explained that item 4 has three sub-items, consisting of: a) definition and identification of OECMs; b) their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11; and c) management approaches. They also mentioned that over the course of the workshop, the participants will be invited to exchange information and experiences and develop recommendations on the three sub-items in order to fulfil the objectives of this workshop.

4.1. Definition and identification of Other Effective Area-Based Conservation Measures and 4.3 Management approaches for other effective area-based conservation measures

34. Mr. Trevor Sandwith, Director IUCN-GPAP, gave a presentation on these two sub-items during the plenary session of the Workshop. He introduced in detail the definition and identification, as well as the screening tools, and the recommended approaches for the identification of OECMs. He presented a summary of the important information from the *Guidelines for Recognizing and Reporting other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures* prepared by the IUCN-WCPA Task Force and presented to the workshops as an information document. He explained the difference between protected areas and OECMs. He mentioned that while the primary objective of protected areas is conservation, this is not the case for OECMs which provide effective *in-situ* conservation of biodiversity as an outcome regardless of their management objective. He, then, highlighted the importance of avoiding double counting and the possibility that some OECMs may be recognized and reported as protected areas later on. He also gave examples of what might not be counted as OECMs, for instance, temporary fishing closures, production forest under logging regime, large seascape management policies.

35. Mr. Sandwith explained the four criteria of the screening tool: a) Ensuring that the area is not already recorded as a protected areas; b) Ensuring Target 11 is the appropriate target; c) Ensuring the area has the essential conservation characteristics associated with an OECM under Target 11; and d) Ensuring that the conservation outcome can be sustained when challenged through legal or other effective means. He also discussed the recommended approach for using the screening tool and the six steps to apply for identifying an area as OECM or not, as well as the three types of conservation: a) primary, consisting of areas with conservation as a primary management objective, that may meet all elements of the IUCN definition but are not officially recognised and reported as protected areas; b) secondary, consisting of areas where conservation is an outcome of long-term management, and may be a secondary objective e.g. some watersheds, military lands and waters, permanent and long-term fisheries, areas and territories managed by IPLCs; and c) ancillary conservation (incidental) having to do with areas that deliver long-term conservation outcomes as a by-product of management activities even though biodiversity conservation is not a management objective at all. In conclusion of his presentation, he recommended that the group reflect on, *inter alia*, whether the proposed definition⁶ is clear and acceptable or whether it would need adjustment, and on the screening tool and criteria.

36. Mr. Seutin, Co-chair of the technical expert workshop, invited the participants to exchange views on definition and identification of OECMs in different realms (terrestrial and marine), governance and management systems, and wider geographical situations. Experts from different countries and organizations raised some points for discussion and provided comments and feedbacks. Points that were discussed included monitoring and reporting, importance of highlighting cultural or spiritual values, provision of guidelines to establish tenure, legal framework of conservancies, and ensuring that the three management approaches were adequate for OECMs. Specific terms in the definition and the distinction between the proposed management approaches, and issues related to the criteria of the screening tool

⁶ The other effective area-based conservation measure (OECM), is defined in the Guidelines as: A geographically defined space, not recognised as a protected area, which is governed and managed over the long-term in ways that deliver the effective in-situ conservation of biodiversity, with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values.

were also discussed. In conclusion, Mr. Seutin explained that the scientific and technical advice that the expert participants will develop and adopt at the end of the workshops will give clear guidance on the main issues related to OECMs.

4.2. The Role of Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures in Achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11

37. Mr. Gidda made a presentation on the role and contributions of OECMs not only to Target 11 but also to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, numerous targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the requirements of other multi-lateral environmental agreements, and the Paris Agreement on climate change. He reminded that the contribution of OECMs does not stop at Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and that it is important to showcase concrete evidence of the multiple benefits to convince donors, encourage and motivate Parties, and facilitate the implementation of priority actions to achieve Target 11 through concerted efforts. He highlighted that it would be important to think how the consolidated scientific and technical advice that will be provided at the end of the workshops could be translated into actions at the national level.

38. Mr. Gidda indicated that the majority of marine ecoregions still have less than 10% coverage by protected areas (94 of 232, or 41 per cent in October 2017). A similar proportion of terrestrial ecoregions (361 of 823, or 44 per cent) have reached 17 per cent coverage. Appropriately accounting for OECMs may help fill some of the gaps in ecological representation for the global network of protected and conserved areas. He asked, as an example, that if we map all of the Locally Managed Marine Areas (LMMAs), what would be the status of Target 11 in the marine realm? OECMs contribute to the various elements of Target 11, including Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) and Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites. There is also an increase in shared governance. Mr. Gidda concluded his presentation by highlighting the importance of joining hands and pulling the cart in the same direction to ensure that the achievement of Target 11 by 2020 becomes a reality.

39. The participants were then invited to exchange views on the role of OECMs in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 under different realms (terrestrial and marine), governance systems, and wider geographical situations. The need for security of governance and for the application of the Convention's repatriation of traditional knowledge of IPLCs for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, free, prior and informed consent, and other guidelines under article 8(j) which can be used and incorporated in the guidelines were mentioned as crucial during this session. The importance of mapping and reporting on ICCAs, incentivizing and finding ways to tracking and monitoring incentives, emphasizing the contributions of OECMs, for example, to water security were also highlighted. The preparation of a list of the existing guidelines and assessment tools, and making them readily available was mentioned as useful.

Breakout Groups

40. After the plenary presentations, discussions and exchange of views on the three sub-items consisting of: a) definition and identification of OECMs; b) their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11; and c) management approaches, the participants, divided into three groups with different geographical settings and situations to discuss each of these sub-items. The Co-chair Mr. Seutin reminded the participants to identify areas where there is consensus; areas where there are issues, and check if there are gaps in the definition of OECMs?

- Group 1: South Africa, Malaysia, Azerbaijan; Brazil, Australia, Canada, UNEP-WCMC, ICCA Consortium;
- Group 2: Uganda, Pakistan, Turkmenistan, Costa Rica, Canada, IUCN-WCPA, WWF-Indonesia;

- Group 3: Madagascar² Myanmar, Colombia, Japan, IUCN-GPAP; CCEA, IPLC.

41. The Co-chairs nominated facilitators for each of the breakout groups, based on the expertise and experiences. Each group also nominated a voluntary rapporteur who will prepare a summary of the outcomes for reporting back to plenary. For *Group 1*, Ms. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend, Co-founder of ICCA Consortium was elected as facilitator, and Ms. Naomi Kingston, Head of Protected Areas Programme at UNEP-WCMC, as rapporteur; For *Group 2*, Ms. Cristina Eghenter, Deputy Director for Governance and Social Development at WWF-Indonesia was elected as facilitator, and Mr. Grant Marshall Hogg, Director, Stewardship, Canadian Wildlife Service at Environment and Climate Change Canada, as rapporteur; For *Group 3*, Ms. Clara Matallana Tobon, Adjunct Researcher at Alexander von Humboldt Research Institute for Biological Resources was elected as facilitator and Mr. David MacKinnon, Chair at the Canadian Council on Ecological Areas was elected as rapporteur. The groups were advised to identify where they have consensus and where they find gaps or issues with their proposed solutions.

(1) The Indicative Questions for Discussion

A) For definition and identification of OECMs:

- Whether the suggested definition by the IUCN-WCPA Task Force addresses the requirements of a definition comprehensively or not?
- Whether the suggested identification criteria by the Task Force address the requirements comprehensively in different realms or not? and
- What modifications are needed to address concerns in other sectors?

B) For their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11:

- What are your views on/importance attached to the potential contributions of OECMs?
- Are there any additional contributions of OECMs?
- Provide from your experiences additional examples under each category?

C) For Management approaches of OECMs:

- Whether the suggested management approaches by the Task Force address the requirements comprehensively in different realms or not?
- What modifications are needed to address concerns in other sectors?

(2) Outcome from the Breakout Groups

42. The breakout groups reported on the outcomes of their deliberations to the plenary at the end of the first day of the workshop. The summary of the outcomes is presented below.

43. **Group 1** was overall comfortable with the definition of OECMs as presented in the guidelines by IUCN-WCPA Task Force. One key point was the need to make it clear that OECMs are not new designations, but mechanisms for recognising and understanding the existing scale of area based conservation activities that are ongoing and how they contribute to the achievement of global targets. Also the significance of the governance being secured and recognised in the long term as being critical for the performance of the area. Lots of useful case-studies were discussed and evaluated through the definition – South Africa, Brazil, and Malaysia in particular. The Group felt that further guidance was needed regarding management approaches, as it was not always straightforward to identify which case studies fit into which approach. It was felt that the *screening tool* also needed some rethinking for clarity and to determine who could apply it and on what basis, and for ensuring all of the rights-holders and stakeholders are involved and a lifespan beyond 2020. Proposed Screening Process:

² The representative from Madagascar did not make it in the end due to flight problem.

- (a) Legitimate governance authority reviews the criteria: 2-5⁸;
- (b) Ensure the areas are not listed as protected areas;
- (c) Ensure the areas have the following essential conservation characteristics:
 - (i) Geographically defined and mapped (can be simply mapped, but location needs to be known);
 - (ii) Long-term intent should be known known;
 - (iii) Delivers effective conservation of biodiversity with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values;
 - (iv) Conservation outcomes can be sustained; and
 - (v) Monitoring is in place to track 3 (i-iv).
- (d) Broad societal agreement that the governance will persist in the long-term; and
- (e) Peer review and validation.

44. **Group 2** had some concerns with regards to use of certain terms or language in the definition of OECMs and sought clarification:

- (a) Use of the terms *ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values* in the definition. It was suggested to include “*as appropriate*” at the end; and
- (b) Use of term “*long-term*” - it was not clear whether this term should be defining the management of OECMs or the outcome or whether it was inclusive.

45. There was mention of the importance of traditional values and sustainable livelihoods, as well as incentives for conservation that may need to be covered in more detail in the guidance. Seeking more guidance on effectiveness for OECMs was also highlighted. The Group also felt that the screening and documentation process for OECMs need to be further addressed to better inform on effectiveness. Concern was raised about the order of the four criteria of the screening tool for OECMs, especially with respect to criterion 2 and its perceived negative position. Criterion 2 states: “ensure that Aichi Target 11, as opposed to other Aichi Targets, is the right focus (i.e. *the area is providing in-situ conservation of biodiversity*). To this, Ms. MacKinnon reassured that the criterion will be revised for the final version of the guidelines developed by the Task Force.

46. **Group 3:** Most of the members of this group agreed that the Task Force’s definition of OECM addresses the elements comprehensively. However, some members wondered whether the definition implied that all OECMs should have ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values and sought that clarification be introduced in the explanatory texts for the elements of the definition. Most members supported the individual elements of the definition with comments including that OECMs should not be recognized or reported as OECMs without the free, prior, and informed consent of their governing authorities; proposed different phrasing to the term “long-term”; and agreed on including the expression “nature as a whole” recognizing that species do not exist independently. It was felt that situations where natural and cultural values/objectives are indivisible, as for many areas governed by indigenous peoples and local communities, were not as clearly recognized in the guidance as they should have been. However, there was no disagreement with the way the contributions of OECMs to various targets and goals were described in the information document: CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/INF/4 presented to inform the workshop.

ITEM 5. PROVISION OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL ADVICE ON THE ABOVE SUB-ITEMS AND VOLUNTARY GUIDANCE PURSUANT TO PARAGRAPH 10(a) OF DECISION XIII/2

47. Over the following two days, the joint group formed of the participants of OECMs-Target 11 and experts from Marine-OECMs further discussed the three sub-items, namely, the definitions and

⁸ This governance authority could be any of the governance types as defined by the IUCN-WCPA Task Force.

identification of OECMs; their contributions to Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and Management approaches during breakout groups and plenary sessions. This joint group was co-chaired by one of the Co-chairs of the OECM-Target 11, Mr. Gilles Seutin (Canada) or Ms. Montezuma (Costa Rica), and one of the Co-chairs of Marine-OECMs, Mr. Kevin Stringer (Canada) or Mr. Moustafa Fouda (Egypt).

48. Various issues and terms were discussed and experiences shared. In general, OECMs were acknowledged to be very important in both realms (terrestrial and marine) but that they may need financial or other support to stay sustainable in the long-run. Furthermore, many of the benefits that are generated from OECMs may be in the form of co-benefits as conservation is not an objective for these areas but an outcome. These multiple and important benefits should be appropriately accounted for. It was also mentioned that biodiversity can be damaged by nature and that OECMs can help recover such loss. For example, co-managed areas assisted in removal of marine debris in Japan because of the sense of ownership of the resources.

49. After extensive discussion and deliberations, in joint breakout groups and plenary session, the joint group, agreed on the consolidated scientific and technical advice/guidance on OECMs. The group paid extra attention to avoid making the definition too limiting, stringent or prescriptive so that everyone can be able to use it to appropriately account for OECMs. The conclusions of the two workshops regarding “Other Effective Area Based Conservation Measures”, relevant to both realms (terrestrial and marine), that were adopted by the participants of the two workshops are attached as **annex III** to this report. This document, in addition to providing a revised definition of OECMs, also gives guiding principles, a list of criteria for identification of OECMs, description of their management approaches, their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, as well as additional guidance and suggested further steps.

ITEM 6. OTHER MATTERS

50. Under this item, the participants of the workshop were invited to raise other matters related to the subject matter of the meeting.

51. The participants asked the Secretariat to further develop, if necessary, or finalize the different information documents of this workshop and make them available to inform the participants of the forthcoming meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA).

ITEM 7. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT

52. On Friday, 9 February 2018, the workshop adopted the procedural report with the understanding that the Secretariat would finalize the annexes.

ITEM 8. CLOSURE OF THE WORKSHOP

53. The meeting was closed at 4:00 p.m. on Friday, 9 February 2018.

*Annex I***LIST OF PARTICIPANTS****A. PARTIES****Australia**

1. Mr. Peter Cochrane
Advisor
International Union for the Conservation
of Nature (IUCN)
Waverley, NSW, Australia
E-mail: peter.cochrane@hotmail.com

Azerbaijan

2. Ms. Arzu Samadova
Lead Adviser
Department of Protection of
Biodiversity and Development of
Specially Protected Natural Areas
Ministry of Ecology and Natural
Resources
Baku, Azerbaijan
E-mail: samadovaarzu@gmail.com

Brazil

3. Ms. Verônica Alberto Barros
Environmental Analyst
Ministry of Environment
Brasília, Distrito Federal, Brazil
Email: veronica.barros@mma.gov.br

Canada

4. Mr. Grant Marshall Hogg
Director, Stewardship
Canada Wildlife Service (CWS)
Environment Canada and Climate
Change Canada
Gatineau, Québec, Canada
Email : Grant.Hogg@canada.ca

Colombia

5. Ms. Clara Lucia Matallana Tobón
Adjunct Researcher
Program of Terrestrial Management for
Biodiversity Conservation
Alexander von Humboldt Research
Institute
Bogota, Colombia
E-mail: cmatallana@humboldt.org.co

Costa Rica

6. Ms. Eugenia Arguedas Montezuma
Sistema Nacional de Áreas de
Conservación (SINAC)
Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía
San José, Costa Rica
E-mail: eugenia.arguedas@sinac.go.cr;
eugeniaarguedas95@gmail.com

Japan

7. Mr. Naoki Amako
Deputy Director
Biodiversity Strategy Office
Ministry of Environment
Tokyo, Japan
E-mail: naoki_amako@env.go.jp

Malaysia

8. Mr. Allan Rodrigo Balang
Superintendent, Pahang National Park,
Kuala Tahan
Department of Wildlife and National
Parks, Peninsular Malaysia
Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
E-mail: allan@wildlife.gov.my;
allan.balang@yahoo.com

Myanmar

9. Mr. Win Naing Thaw
Director
Nature and Wildlife Conservation
Division, Forest Department,
Ministry of Natural Resources and
Environmental Conservation
Nay Pyi Taw, Myanmar
E-mail: nwcdmof@gmail.com;
putoo911@hotmail.com

Pakistan

10. Mr. Naeem Ashraf Raja
Director
Biodiversity Programme
Ministry of Climate Change
Islamabad, Pakistan
E-mail: naeemashrafraja@yahoo.com

South Africa

11. Mr. Thivhulawi Nethononda

Control Biodiversity Officer (Protected Areas Planning)
Department of Environmental Affairs
Pretoria, Republic of South Africa
E-mail:
Tnethononda@environment.gov.za

Turkmenistan

12. Ms. Shirin B. Karryeva
Project Lobby and Advocacy Manager
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds, and State Committee on Environmental Protection
Ashgabat, Turkmenistan
E-mail: shirinkarryeva.sk@gmail.com

Uganda

13. Mr. Aggrey Rwetsiba
Senior Monitoring and Research Coordinator
Uganda Wildlife Authority
Kampala, Uganda
E-mail:
aggrey.rwetsiba@ugandawildlife.org;
aggreyrwetsiba12@gmail.com;

Canadian Council on Ecological Areas (CCEA), Canada

14. Mr. David MacKinnon
Chair, Canadian Council on Ecological Areas, Systems Planning Coordinator
Nova Scotia Environment
Protected Areas and Ecosystems Branch
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada
E-mail:
david.mackinnon2@novascotia.ca

China Biodiversity Conservation and Green Development Foundation (CBCGDF), China represented by Inclusive Development Consulting

15. Ms. Sadie Yang
Founder and Principal
3 Place Ville Marie, suite 400
Montreal, Canada
E-mail: jz@cbcgdf.org;
sadieyang@inclusive.com

ICCA (territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities) Consortium, Switzerland

16. Dr. Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend
Co-founder of ICCA-Consortium
Global Coordinator and Main Strategy Adviser, ICCA-Consortium
Rolle, Switzerland
E-mail: gbf@iccaconsortium.org

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLC) – Nomination from Guatemala

17. Ms. Christine Teresa Grant
Principal Director of CTG Services
Co-Chair of Advisory Committee for Indigenous Repatriation
Queensland, Australia
E-mail: chrissy@webone.com.au

ORGANIZATIONS

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

- **World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**
18. Dr. Kathy MacKinnon
Chair, IUCN - World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)
Haddenham, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: kathy.mackinnon@iucn.org
- **Global Protected Areas Programme (IUCN-GPAP), Switzerland**
19. Mr. Trevor Sandwith
Director
IUCN - Global Protected Areas Programme (GPAP)
Gland, Switzerland
E-mail: trevor.sandwith@iucn.org
- Parks Canada – Protected Areas Establishment and Conservation Directorate**
20. Mr. Gilles Seutin
Chief Scientist, Office of the Chief Ecosystem Scientist, Protected Areas Establishment and Conservation Directorate, Parks Canada
E-mail: gilles.seutin@pc.gc.ca
- World Wildlife Fund (WWF) International, Indonesia**
21. Ms. Cristina Eghenter
Deputy Director for Governance and Social Development
World Wildlife Fund International
Jakarta Selatan, Indonesia
E-mail: ceghenter@wwf.id;
cristina.eghenter@gmail.com
- UNEP - World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland**
22. Ms. Naomi Kingston
Head of Protected Areas Programme
United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC)
Cambridge, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
E-mail: naomi.kingston@unep-wcmc.org
- Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), Montreal, Canada**
23. Dr. Sarat Babu Gidda
Head of Conservation and Sustainable Use unit (CSU), Senior Programme Officer for Protected Areas, Scientific and Policy Support Division (SPS)
E-mail: sarat.gidda@cbd.int
24. Ms. Edjigayehu Seyoum-Edjigu
Member of Protected Areas Team, CSU, SPS
E-mail: edjigayehu.seyoum@cbd.int
25. Mr. Patrick Gannon
Member of Protected Areas Team, CSU, SPS
E-mail: patrick.gannon@cbd.int
26. Mr. Bruno Leles
Member of Protected Areas Team, CSU, SPS
E-mail: bruno.leles.intern@cbd.int
27. Ms. Megan Schmidt
Member of Protected Areas Team, CSU, SPS
E-mail: megan.schmidt@cbd.int
28. Ms. Sarah Stephen
Member of Protected Areas Team, CSU, SPS
E-mail: sarah.stephen@cbd.int

Annex I

PROVISIONAL ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Tuesday, 6 February 2018		
	Technical Expert Workshop on OECM to Achieve Target 11	Expert Workshop on marine Target 11
9 - 10.45 a.m.	Joint opening, organizational matters and Workshop background/scope/expected outputs (agenda items 1, 2 & 3)	
10.45 – 11.15 a.m.	Joint coffee/tea break	
11.15 a.m.-12.30 p.m.	OECM-item 4 - Plenary	Marine Target 11-item 4 - Plenary
12.30 – 2 p.m.	Joint lunch break	
2 - 3.30 p.m.	OECM-item 4 - Breakout Groups	Marine Target 11-item 4 - Breakout Groups
3.30 – 4 p.m.	Joint coffee/tea break	
4 – 5 p.m.	OECM-item 4 Report of the results of the Breakout Group Session	Marine Target 11-item 4 Report of the results of the Breakout Group Session
Wednesday, 7 February 2018		
9 - 10.30 a.m.	Joint Plenary Summary of Day 1 workshop discussion Reporting on OECM discussion, followed by Q & A Reporting on marine Target 11 discussion, followed by Q & A Plenary Discussion	
10.30 – 11 a.m.	Joint coffee/tea break	
11 a.m. -12.30 p.m.	Joint Breakout group on OECM-item 4 / Marine OECM-item 5	MPA-item 5 - Breakout groups
12.30 – 2 p.m.	Joint lunch break	
2 - 3.30 p.m.	Joint Breakout group on OECM-item 4/Marine OECM-item 5 (<i>continued</i>)	MPA-item 5 - Breakout groups (<i>continued</i>)
3.30 – 4 p.m.	Joint coffee/tea break	
4 – 5.30 p.m.	OECM-item 4 Plenary	Marine Target 11-item 5 Plenary

Thursday, 8 February 2018			
9 -10. 30 a.m.	Summary of Day 2 workshop discussion Reporting on OECM discussion, followed by Q & A Reporting on marine Target 11 discussion, followed by Q & A Plenary Discussion		
10.30 – 11 a.m.	Joint coffee/tea break		
11 a.m. – 12.30 p.m.	OECM-item 5 Breakout group	Joint breakout group Marine OECM sub-group (OECM-item 5 as applied to marine, and marine Target 11- item 6 on OECM)	Marine Target 11-item 6 Breakout group on MPA
12.30 – 2 p.m.	Joint lunch break		
2 - 3.30 p.m.	OECM-item 5 Breakout group (<i>continued</i>)	Joint breakout group Marine OECM sub-group (OECM-item 5 as applied to marine, and marine Target 11-item 6 on OECM)	Marine Target 11-item 6 Breakout group on MPA (<i>continued</i>)
3.30 – 4 p.m.	Joint coffee/tea break		
4 -5.30 p.m.	OECM-items 5 and 6 Plenary	Marine Target 11-items 6 and 7 Plenary	
Friday, 9 February 2018			
9 -10 a.m.	Distribution of draft reports		
10 – 10.30 a.m.	Joint coffee/tea break		
10.30 a.m. -12.30 p.m.	Joint Plenary Session – Adoption of the report (focusing on OECM matters) OECM-item 7 and Marine Target 11-item 8		
12.30 – 2 p.m.	Joint lunch break		
2 – 5 p.m.	OECM-item 7 Plenary (Adoption of the report) and item 8 Closure of the workshop at 4:00 p.m.	Marine Target 11-item 8 (Adoption of the report) and item 9	

CONCLUSIONS OF TECHNICAL EXPERT WORKSHOPS ON OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING TARGET 11 AND MARINE PROTECTED AREAS AND OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA-BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR ACHIEVING AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11 IN MARINE AND COASTAL AREAS REGARDING “OTHER EFFECTIVE AREA BASED CONSERVATION MEASURES”

1. At its tenth meeting in October 2010, the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Biological Diversity adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, including 20 Aichi Biodiversity Targets under five strategic goals. Strategic Goal C on improving the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity includes, among others, Target 11 which states that: *“By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes”*.
2. In paragraph 10(b) of decision XIII/2, the Conference of the Parties requested the Executive Secretary to organize a technical expert workshop or workshops to provide scientific and technical advice on definition, management approaches and identification of other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) and their role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Accordingly, the workshops were held in Montreal, Canada from 6-9 February 2018. The conclusions of the Workshops with respect to OECMs are as follows:
3. This guidance provides general principles that should be applied in a flexible way and on a case-by-case basis.

A. DEFINITION

“Other effective area-based conservation measure” means “A geographically defined area other than a Protected Area, which is governed and managed in ways that achieve positive and sustained outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity,⁹ with associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values”.

B. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Guiding general principles should be applied in a flexible way and on a case-by-case basis.

- (a) Other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) have a biodiversity value, which is the basis for their consideration to achieve Target 11 of Strategic Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011 and 2020;
- (b) OECMs reflect an opportunity to provide in situ conservation of biodiversity over the long term. They may allow for sustainable human activity while offering a clear benefit to biodiversity conservation and avoiding negative impacts on biodiversity. By recognizing an area, there is an incentive for sustaining existing biodiversity values and improving biodiversity conservation outcomes;
- (c) OECMs deliver biodiversity outcomes that are comparable with and complementary to those of protected areas;
- (d) OECMs demonstrate positive biodiversity outcomes by preventing, reducing or eliminating existing, or reasonably anticipated main threats, and strengthening existing protections. OECM management is consistent with the ecosystem approach and the precautionary principle, providing the ability to adapt to achieve biodiversity outcomes, including long-term outcomes, and including the ability to manage a new threat;

² As defined by Article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in line with the provisions of the Convention.

(e) OECMs help deliver greater representativeness and connectivity in protected area systems and thus may help address larger and pervasive threats and enhance resilience, including with regard to climate change;

(f) Definition and criteria for identification of OECMs is applicable across all ecosystems, and identification should be on case-by-case basis;

(g) Recognition of OECMs in areas within the territories of indigenous peoples and local communities should be on the basis of self-identification and require their free, prior and informed consent;

(h) Recognition of OECMs should follow appropriate consultation with relevant governance authorities, stakeholders and the public;

(i) Areas conserved for cultural and spiritual values, and governance and management that respect and are informed by cultural and spiritual values, often result in positive biodiversity outcomes;

(j) OECMs recognize, promote and make visible the roles of different governance systems and actors in biodiversity conservation;

(k) Incentives to ensure effectiveness can include a range of social and ecological benefits, including empowerment of indigenous peoples and local communities;

(l) The best available scientific information, including indigenous and local knowledge, should be used for recognizing OECMs, delimiting their location and size, informing management approaches and measuring performance.

C. CRITERIA FOR IDENTIFICATION

Criterion A: Area is not currently recognized as a protected area	
Not a protected area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The area is not currently recognized or reported as a protected area or part of a protected area; it may have been established for another purpose.
Criterion B: Area is governed and managed	
Geographically defined space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Size and area are described, including in three dimensions where necessary. Boundaries are described.
Legitimate governance authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governance has legitimate authority and is appropriate for achieving in situ conservation of biodiversity within the area. Governance by indigenous peoples and local communities is self-identified and peer reviewed. Governance reflects the equity considerations adopted in the Convention. Governance may be by a single authority or through collaboration among relevant authorities and provides the ability to address threats collectively.
Managed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant authorities are identified and involved in management and responsible authorities are identified. A management system is in place that contributes to sustaining the in situ conservation of biodiversity. Management is consistent with the ecosystem approach with the ability to adapt to achieve biodiversity outcomes, including long-term outcomes, and including the ability to manage a new threat.
Criterion C: Achieves sustained and effective contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity	

Effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The area achieves, or is expected to achieve, positive and sustained outcomes for the in situ conservation of biodiversity. • Current threats are well understood. • Significant threats are addressed effectively. • Mechanisms, such as policy frameworks and regulations, are in place to recognize and respond to new threats. • To the extent possible, management inside and outside the OECM is integrated.
Sustained over long term	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The OECM is in place for the long term or is likely to be. • “Sustained” pertains to the continuity of governance and management and “long term” pertains to the outcome.
Information and monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of an OECM should, to the extent possible, document the known biodiversity attributes, including cultural and/or spiritual values, of the area and the governance and management in place as a baseline for assessing effectiveness. • A monitoring system informs management measures with respect to biodiversity. • Processes should be in place to evaluate the effectiveness of governance and management, including with respect to equity.
Criterion D: Associated ecosystem services and cultural and spiritual values	
Ecosystem services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem services are supported, particularly those of importance to indigenous peoples and local communities, taking into account interactions and trade-offs among ecosystem services, with a view to ensuring positive biodiversity outcomes and equity.
Cultural and spiritual values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance and management measures identify, respect and uphold the cultural and spiritual significance and values of the area. • Governance and management measures respect and uphold the knowledge, practices and institutions that are fundamental for the in situ conservation of biodiversity.

D. FURTHER CONSIDERATIONS

1. Management approaches

(a) OECMs are diverse in terms of purpose, design, governance, participants and management, especially as they consider associated cultural and spiritual values. Accordingly, management approaches for OECMs are and will be diverse;

(b) Some OECMs are established, recognized or managed to intentionally sustain in situ conservation of biodiversity. This purpose is either the primary management objective, or part of a set of intended management objectives;

(c) Some OECMs may be established, recognized or managed primarily for purposes other than in situ conservation of biodiversity. Thus their contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity is a co-benefit to their primary intended management objective or purpose. However, where a contribution to in situ conservation of biodiversity is incidental to the primary stated purpose of the OECM, it is desirable that this contribution become a recognized objective of the management of the OECM;

(d) In all cases where in situ conservation of biodiversity is recognized as a management objective, specific management measures should be defined and enabled.

2. Role in achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11

(a) By definition, OECMs contribute to both quantitative (i.e. the 17% and 10% coverage elements) and qualitative elements (i.e. representativity, coverage of areas important for biodiversity,

connectivity and integration in wider landscapes and seascapes, management effectiveness and equity) of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11;

(b) Since OECMs are diverse in terms of purpose, design, governance, and management, they will often also contribute to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, targets of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the objectives or targets of other multilateral environmental agreements.¹⁰

3. *Additional guidance*

(a) Further screening and evaluation tools need to be developed in the light of experiences acquired as a result of the application of this guidance;

(b) Monitoring the effectiveness of OECMs needs more guidance, information sharing, networking and sharing of available tools, and development of new tools where necessary. This guidance could include: (i) baseline data, such as documentation of the biodiversity values and elements; (ii) ongoing community-based monitoring and incorporation of traditional knowledge; (iii) monitoring over the long term, including how to sustain biodiversity and improve in situ conservation; and (iv) monitoring of governance and management systems that contribute to the biodiversity outcomes;

(c) Manuals for reporting in the World Database on Protected Areas, the registry of territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities maintained by the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre, and other guidance documents of the Convention on Biological Diversity and, as appropriate, sectoral agencies provide useful guidance for reporting OECMs;

(d) While the contribution of OECMs to the quantitative elements of Target 11 are relatively straightforward to assess, further studies and guidance are needed to better understand and communicate how their contribution to qualitative elements of Target 11 can be enhanced;

(e) Further studies to better understand and communicate the full range of OECM contributions to other targets, and engagement with other sectors;

(f) Further guidance is needed concerning the size of individual areas, and areas that are part of networks, needed to achieve biodiversity outcomes;

(g) Further guidance is needed on how OECMs of indigenous people and local communities are recognized and supported.

E. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STEPS

Participants of the workshop suggested that:

(a) The Conference of the Parties should consider adopting the guidance.

(b) Capacity-building will be necessary to enable the application of the guidance, and thus governments and relevant organizations should be encouraged to facilitate such capacity-building.

(c) Parties should be encouraged to submit case studies and examples of OECM management approaches, including through application of the guidance, for dissemination through the clearing-house mechanism.

¹⁰ CBD/PA/EM/2018/1/INF/4 provides many examples of these contributions.